

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **June 1, 2004**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-33. Claims 1-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dewa et al (USPN 6,230,279, hereinafter "Dewa") in view of Godfrey (USPN 6,091,255, hereinafter "Godfrey").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 11, 23, and 24 were rejected as being unpatentable over Dewa in view of Godfrey. Applicant respectfully points out that Dewa teaches a user interface that **allows a user to provide acceleration/deceleration instructions** from a user (see Dewa, col. 3, lines 4-33, and col. 10, line 63 to col. 11, line 5).

In contrast, the present invention is directed to determining if the processor complex is executing a computationally intensive task using a current sensor and, if so, **increasing the clock speed in response to an increased current** (see page 8, lines 7-15 of the instant application). It is beneficial to determine if the processor complex is executing a computationally intensive task using a current sensor and, if so, to increase the clock speed in response to the increased current because it allows the system to respond to computationally intensive tasks without intervention by a user. There is nothing within Dewa or Godfrey, either separately or in concert, which suggests determining if the processor complex is executing a computationally intensive task using a current sensor and, if so, increasing the clock speed in response to the increased current.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, 23, and 24 to include limitations from claims 3, 13, and 26 to clarify that the present invention determines if the processor complex is executing a computationally intensive task using a current sensor and, if so, increases the clock speed in response to the increased current. These amendments find support on page 8,

lines 7-15 of the instant application. Dependent claims 3, 13, and 26 have been amended to remove the limitations amended into the independent claims.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, 23, and 24 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-10, which depend upon claim 1, claims 12-22, which depend upon claim 11, and claims 25-33, which depend upon claim 24, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: June 9, 2004

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616-4692
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665